

VOLUME 8.

NUMBER 6.

PRICE 1/-.

# Christian Order

## Summary of Contents for June, 1967

CHURCH AND SOCIETY

*The Editor*

STUDENTS IN TURMOIL

*Observer*

SHORTFALL

*Paul Crane, S.J.*

A NOTE ON LIBERALISM

*H. W. J. Edwards*

INCOMES POLICY

*J. M. Jackson*

CRITICISM AND AUTHORITY

*E. L. Way*

DESTROY THIS TEMPLE

*Vincent Rochford*

# Contents

Page

321 A MATTER OF BALANCE  
*The Editor*

324 A NOTE ON LIBERALISM  
*H. W. J. Edwards*

334 "DESTROY THIS TEMPLE . . ."

338 LETTERS TO THE CATHOLIC LEFT.  
4: CHURCH AND SOCIETY  
*The Editor*

351 CRITICISM AND AUTHORITY  
*E. L. Way*

356 STUDENTS IN TURMOIL: PARTIAL  
BACKGROUND. 1: RADICAL  
STUDENTS ALLIANCE  
*Observer*

362 INCOMES POLICY: THE SECOND  
YEAR  
*J. M. Jackson*

370 THE COUNCIL AND MARRIAGE: 2.  
*John F. McDonald*

381 BOOK REVIEW

## IF YOU CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS:

If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

**CHRISTIAN ORDER** is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Furnival St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by The Record Press Ltd., Emmet Road, Bray. Annual subscription: one year, fifteen shillings; in the U.S.A. and Canada three dollars; in Australia twenty-one shillings; postage paid.

Those who previously bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 15/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,  
43 Parkgate Street,  
Dublin 8, Ireland.

# Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

---

VOL. 8.

JUNE, 1967.

NUMBER 6.

---

## A Matter of Balance

THE EDITOR

FIVE years ago I was taken on a guided tour of the worst slum I have ever been through in my life. It was in a section of Karachi where twenty thousand people, mostly displaced Punjabis, lived on four acres of ground. My companion was a Capuchin Father. The strength of his compassion for the slum-dwellers alone made my tour tolerable. Without it, I would have gone off in a corner and been violently sick.

I have thought of that slum in Karachi twice in recent months; when similar conditions in Calcutta were shown on *Panorama* last March, when I was reading shortly afterwards George Scott's book on the English Catholics, which is reviewed elsewhere in this issue. In his opening pages, Scott describes the living conditions of Glasgow's Irish Catholic immigrants in 1848. This is what a medical inspector had to say about them at the time:

"Those frightful abodes of human wretchedness which lie along the High Street, Saltmarket and Bridgegate and constitute the bulk of that district known as the 'Wynds and Closes of Glasgow'—it is in these localities that all sanitary evils exist in perfection. These places consist of ranges of narrow closes, only some four or five feet in width, and of great length. The houses are so lofty that the direct light of the sky never reaches a large proportion

of the dwellings. The ordinary atmospheric ventilation is impossible. The cleansing until lately was most inefficient, and from structural causes will always, under existing arrangements, be difficult and expensive. There are large square middensteads, some of them actually under the houses, and all of them in the immediate vicinity of the windows and doors of human dwellings. These receptacles hold the entire filth and offal of large masses of people and households, until country farmers can be bargained with for their removal. There is no drainage in these neighbourhoods, except in a few cases; and from the want of any means of flushing, the sewers, where they do exist, are extended cesspools polluting the air. So little is the use of sewers known that on one occasion I saw the entire surface of a backyard covered for several inches with green putrid water, although there was a sewer in the close within a few feet into which it might have been drained away. The water supply is also very defective; such a thing as a household supply is unknown, and I have been informed that from the state of the law the water companies find it impossible to recover rates, and that, had the cholera not appeared, it was in contemplation to have cut off the entire supply from this class of property."

The point to notice is that these dreadful conditions are more or less identical with those I was to find in Karachi a hundred and twenty years later. The reader will agree, I imagine, that it would be not merely unfeeling, but ludicrous to expect the unfortunate Punjabis who have to endure these conditions in Karachi today to do anything more than keep themselves alive. Quite apart from their inferior religious status as an animistic drop in a Muslim ocean, the appalling poverty of Karachi's slum-ridden Punjabi minority necessarily confines their activity to that of a struggle for bare existence and nothing more. To expect them to go beyond this; to think of them, despite the appalling circumstances of their lives, as meant to influence their Muslim surroundings—worse, to blame them years later for not doing so—would be to show an insensitivity to human suffering, along with a lack of historical understanding so



great as almost to defy imagination. Yet, this precisely is what those Catholics do who make it their business nowadays to look back in anger at what they think of as the failure of their spiritual ancestors to influence the course of this country's public life.

New Left Catholics are particularly guilty in this respect, with their irresponsible and almost totally unhistorical talk of Catholicism's compromise with nineteenth-century capitalism. Their upstage conversation reveals no understanding of the Catholic Irish and the Church they built, despite so much suffering, in nineteenth-century England. It was their great triumph to keep themselves and their Faith alive in the midst of living conditions unfit for human beings made in the image of God and in the face of bigotry that made the mere retention by the Irish of their Faith an outsize victory in itself. For this they deserve our lasting gratitude. To sneer at them, instead, because they did not do more, to accuse the Irish of capitulating before capitalist evil because, to keep themselves alive in their wretchedness, they submitted to starvation wages doled out by employers who sweated their very guts for profit; to brand them as failures because, in their misery, they did not influence the shape of evolving society, is to display not merely meanness, but the kind of historical blindness, which makes a mockery of any profession of scholarship.

I wonder how far Father Herbert McCabe and his friends in the New Left Church would have got under circumstances similar to those which surrounded the Irish immigrants in Glasgow and South Wales. It would be good if the Slant Group could take a stroll through the slums of Karachi. Were they to do so, a fairer measure of historical balance would be injected into their writing.

---

The liberal lays great stress on human reasonings and tends to ignore human nature. He thinks of society as if it were a mechanical contrivance rather than a living entity. Edmund Burke reminds us that reason is but a part, and by no means the great part, of human nature.

## A Note on Liberalism

H. W. J. EDWARDS

|N an earlier article in *Christian Order* I mentioned that the word 'liberal' has still a certain and precise meaning which may be applied to fervent conservatives as when we say that someone has a liberal education or that he has a liberal and humane mind. The meaning here suggests a certain magnanimity and a species of manners probably today felt to be slightly old-fashioned.

The word has, however, come to have so many meanings that we may be pardoned for supposing it has no meanings whatever. If a certain Catholic brought up under Evangelical Protestant parents contrives a certain private dialogue with Evangelicals, some of whom may be what we may call fundamentalists, it is not unlikely that he will be called a liberal. That he may attempt to state where Catholics and Evangelicals agree even if he is forced to point to serious divergences suffices to brand him as 'liberal' when he himself detests the very suggestion that he is inclined to what he often attacks as liberalism.

In much the same way Newman was called and is still called a liberal when his vitally important contribution to the study of Liberalism, the Tamworth Reading Room, amounts to a denunciation of liberalism.

### "Liberalism" and a Liberal Education

The case of Newman suggests that the best sort of philosophical conservative is an exponent of what is really

liberal, as in the defence of a liberal education. Newman's case for liberal education has, of course, nothing to do with the "liberalism" he abhorred. He first heard the word "liberalism" in connection with the opinions of Byron and his admirers. "Afterwards, Liberalism was the badge of a theological school of a dry and repulsive character, not very dangerous in itself, though dangerous as opening the door to evils which it did not itself either anticipate or comprehend. At present it is nothing else than that deep plausible scepticism . . . the development of human reason as practically exercised by the natural man."

Liberal education is for Newman the intellectual training of free men who live within the compasses of God's ordinances. "If virtue be a mastery over the mind, if its end be action, if its perfection be inward order, harmony and peace, we must seek it in graver and holier places than libraries and reading rooms." To the Good Victorian such sentiments must have seemed naughty indeed, because most of the Good Victorians—there were important exceptions—believed that men could be educated with ease through libraries and reading rooms.

I have just been listening to a talk preserved in the B.B.C. archives, a talk by that great survivor of the Great Victorians, Professor Gilbert Murray, in which he spoke of the deep sense of optimism which pervaded the age of his childhood. But Newman never gave way to that pleasurable emotion. "The sight of the world is nothing else than the prophet's scroll, full of 'lamentations and mournings and woe'". He would have nothing to do with the fashionable thesis that a new social order would change the substantial lot of mankind.

### *Fitting in with the Age*

Nevertheless the word still requires close attention. In Newman's day the church condemned "liberalism", though we may be in some doubt about what that condemnation really means for us today. We may, indeed, suppose that what the church condemned in the 19th century the church approves in the 20th. I cannot be brought to believe that.



Perhaps my own way of looking at the matter is akin to my looking at the condemnation by the church of 16th century doctrines about justification by faith alone. Today such a condemnation is hardly necessary, at least in view of the widespread heresy on the other side, namely the heresy of justification by good works alone, a heresy, oddly enough, which we shall find among the spiritual descendants of 17th century solifidians.

That point, I notice, has already been made very neatly by the late Mgr. Ronald Knox, who, in the context, showed that it is the world rather than the church which shifts ground from age to age. If this be so, we ought to be on our guard against the tempting proposal to fit in with the age. Indeed, how does a Liberal fare when the age suddenly becomes obscurantist and conservative in some bad sense of hating any kind of change or regarding tradition not as something vital like the roots of a tree but as the ivy on romantic walls? Professor Wootton has told us—as becomes a characteristic Liberal in the sense I have in mind—that moral standards are simply approved behaviour-patterns to which we ought to conform. But someone like Professor Wootton would forget her liberalism in face of some evidently authoritarian régime which might well have been voted in by the electorate.

### *Bentham and Coleridge*

If I may be permitted a slight autobiographical note, it is to say that as a young man reared in the liberal atmosphere I came to dislike the spirit of liberalism. As Pascal told us, “reasons come afterwards”. But it was my good fortune to be introduced quite early in life to the writings of Coleridge who for this purpose gave us veritable bread. It would not be too much to say that in this respect Coleridge and Jeremy Bentham provide us with key points. It has been written that Bentham spoke in terms of statistics, Coleridge in terms of ideas, that where Bentham would ask, “is it true?”, Coleridge would ask “what does it mean”.

Here are two radically different attitudes. To suppose,



as many do, that conservatism shades off, so to speak, into liberalism is to suppose that they are related to each other in degree. The difference is one of kind. Brinton in his work on English political Thought in the 19th Century described that special kind of conservative, the man who works out a consistent and timeless generalisation applying to the behaviour of men in politics. Coleridge was such a man. But it seemed that such a man would fail in the age of the new industrialists and the shopkeepers, who, wrote Coleridge, were in all ages and in all nations the least conservative of any class.

In his *Table Talk* there is an illuminating passage where he tells that blue-stocking liberal, Harriet Martineau, that she seemed to regard society as no more than the sum total of individuals. "Of course, that is how I look at it", she replied. But Coleridge could not agree with her. For him and for other philosophical conservatives the society of the nation was produced by the social and other relationships of individuals. I have not space here to deal with the notion that Coleridge owed much to continental thought. I am sure this is wrong. But it is true that certain continental thinkers were saying much that he was saying. The so-called German romantics repudiated the mechanical, analytical and abstract theses of the liberals because they saw the near-organic totality of given societies. For them there was a great nexus of contents interlocked and suffused. The first data were not individuals but customs, clusters, groups, relationships.

### *'One Man Two Votes'*

On the other hand I must admit that the liberal does wonders with his individualistically formed data. It seems natural that he is essentially a man for majorities. He believes in One Man One Vote as I believe in Credo in Unum Deum. And this quasi-religious belief—for that is what it amounts to—has been so sedulously implanted in us that there are few indeed who would deny that it is a natural right. In much the same way we have come to believe that Majority Rule is of divine origin.

Of course, none of us likes to be challenged on his first principles. No one—whether he is of the Right, Centre or Left—cares to be asked for reasons on this score, and it is probably significant, as the highbrows say, that the American Constitution talks about “self-evident truths” of which one, which always seems to me to be highly doubtful, is “the pursuit of happiness”.

No doubt the slogan, One Man One Vote, could be well defended in some historic polity (like Andorra) where the tradition has been of long standing. But when I was talking to Scottish Nationalists at Edinburgh University last year I noticed that their slogan was One Man Two Votes. I was most interested in their defence of this slogan since it was a defence based on the historic Scottish Estates and the vocational group.

One conclusion of the atomising liberal is much before my own nation at this time since the Secretary for Wales, Mr. Cledwyn Hughes, has announced his plain intention of getting rid of all the small farmers who give Wales its social tone.

A political economist of the liberal school told Coleridge that, since more food was grown through Highland Scottish evictions, clearances and the like, and that since the mutton produced must be eaten somewhere, it were well that three men should eat it in Manchester, rather than one in Glencoe. Coleridge, as we may guess, disagreed. “Men, I think, should be weighed not counted. Their worth ought to be the final estimate.”

### *Inequality*

At this point, however, the virtuous liberal feels sure he has the edge over his opponent. Coleridge, for all his keen sense of injustice towards the workers of his time (he might be regarded in some vague sense as a socialist), seems to have defended inequality. And the virtuous liberal passionately hates inequality. Moreover, he feels that the Christian gospel is on his side. Unfortunately, this word “inequality” is emotive and contains certain undertones suggestive of injustice. I often get bogged down by it especially when I try to deny the equality of indigenous Africans and so-

called "whites". It will not suffice for the liberal to be told that different races are neither equal nor unequal. I regard myself as grossly inferior to the Emperor of Ethiopia or the negro Cardinal. But that is by the way. All this talk about equality is a red herring. I do not find any of it in the Gospel where the Kingdom is extraordinary hierarchic starting with the orders of the angels. Among the saints this hierarchy continues with Mary Theotokos the queen. Our Lord told the crowd that the meanest in the kingdom would be greater than his cousin, John the Baptist.

If I were inclined to the making of polemics, I would cry out bitterly against the liberal egalitarians who in the name of equality have already evicted the rooted peasantry from the Upper Towy, Cwm Tryweryn and Cwm Clywedog in my country and who have plans to rape a dozen more river valleys in order to aid conurbations in another land. In this confrontation we have to consider the argument from quality against the argument from quantity. It was an argument which Father Morrison of South Uist did use in his campaign against the alien invaders who wanted South Uist for a rocket station.

### *Necessary Progress*

The liberal, however, believes in some species of fatalism—a paradox of sorts. He believes in Necessary Progress which he connotes with industrialism. I myself am unhappy that even in Catholic documents the words "developed" and "undeveloped" are used ill, as if a country with a high culture could be properly called "undeveloped". It is, however, only fair to say that in *Mater et Magistra* the good pope criticised industrial adventurers who attempted to destroy the values found in these "undeveloped" countries. Meanwhile even the man who wants to defend a national tradition of peasant type is carried before the liberal storm. He has unfortunately rested his case on certain liberal premises.

In the 19th century it appeared as if liberals were most concerned with the claims of nations to independence. I



believe that to some extent this concern was adventitious. Indeed, in such a case as Savoy it was the reactionary conservative de Maistre who strove against the liberals for its independence. The affair of the cantons of Switzerland who wanted maximum decentralisation tells against the liberals. Meagher of the Sword, the fiery orator of the Young Ireland group, often attacked liberals for their attitude towards Irish independence.

Nevertheless the feeling persists that the 19th century liberals were keen on national right. And the feeling persists that it is due to the essentially liberal doctrine of self-determination as set out by that characteristic liberal, President Wilson, in his message to the American Senate in 1917. Here, they say, is the basis on which nations may make their case for independence. "No peace can last or ought to last which does not recognise and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from potentate to potentate as if they were property." Not that we should defend the handing of peoples from one potentate to another. The point at issue is "self determination" and the notion that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. If we demand that, then many good and honourable governments in known history were bad. St. Louis of France would have been a tyrant. It is true that, given a certain background and national temper, some nations properly have a polity in which the citizens take part in the government. In some societies, e.g. certain Swiss cantons, there is direct democracy (compare our very indirect type).

### *Consent of Governed*

But how shall we discover whether the governed consent? The Vote, answers the liberal. Yet one very influential religious denomination which has taken a leading part in progressive legislation, the Society of Friends, has conducted all its own affairs without ever taking a vote. The Society of Friends go by "the sense of the meeting", a piece of

evidence that shows that election is not the only way in which there may be representation or policy making. I am convinced that in a given society where there is a reasonable homogeneity and united aim something akin to the Quaker "sense of the meeting" may be found.

The danger comes when someone concocts a theory of the General Will of the People. One may make a criticism here about this use of "the people" which, as Disraeli and others have pointed out, is not strictly a political term. "The word people", wrote de Maistre, "is a relative term which has no sense when separated from the idea of sovereignty, for the idea of a people evokes the idea of an aggregate around a common centre and without sovereignty there is no ensemble and no political unity. The mass of the people is of no account in political creations." For such as de Maistre, it is not a people that chooses a leader but leaders who create a people. The sovereign nation does not hand over a revocable trust to its leaders; rather it is the principle of sovereignty around which a nation becomes crystallised. The nation arrives when a king and his company create the cadres, the forms and the channels.

And then it may be said with considerable good reason that authority must always appear to come to the governed from outside itself. It is not true that the governed will obey a government of its own choice. And it is notorious that republics formed on paper constitutions with all the preambles suitable to modern democracies are often in a state of rebellion.

Now far from my defending tyranny, it is my contention that a very grave form of tyranny has come from the theory of the General Will of the People. There is a special and proper sense in which the word "liberal" describes certain enemies of the Jacobin General Will. One thinks of the French liberal, Constant, who realised the peril to mankind was not in the ancien régime but in the doctrines of the Democratists who demanded in effect a totalitarian régime.

### *Once the General Will is declared Sacred*

The ancien régime of France had always allowed local

privileges, notably the maintenance of the Breton Estates. But in the name of liberty the Jacobins destroyed the last vestiges of Breton nationhood. Constant wrote: "The grossest sophisms of the most ferocious apostles of terror, the most revolting inferences, were nothing but perfectly justified conclusions from Rousseau. Once the popular will is equated with some notional general will and is then declared sacred and infallible, those who claim to represent it have no qualms in committing acts which no tyrant would have dared do in his own name." "The people which can do all is dangerous, indeed more dangerous than any tyrant, or it is rather certain that tyranny will seize the rights accorded to the people. It will need do nothing more than proclaim the omnipotence of the people by threatening it and to speak in its name by imposing silence upon it."

How curiously up to date that sounds. But I ought to mention de Toqueville in this context since of late I gather he has begun to be studied again. Until 1848 he always used the word 'democracy' in the derogatory sense that implied the theory of the General Will. And he opposed that false democracy because he saw it meant absolutism. "These absolute systems are narrow underneath their pretence of broadness and false beneath the air of mathematical exactness."

If we call de Toqueville a liberal, it is rather the liberalism of a man who abhors absolutism. Perhaps he might be called a French Whig rather like Acton.

Acton is, of course, a pivotal name in this debate. Talking to Sir Henry Maine who had given a defence of the English system of primogeniture (which needs to be defended in England for the same reason that gavelkind must be defended in my land), Acton commented: "You give a Tory tinge to your lecture". Maine who was not at that time a Tory (if ever he was) answered: "You seem to use 'Tory' as a term of reproach". Acton was taken aback. What? A friend of his he thought a liberal, possibly tolerant of Toryism? The experiences which caused Maine to think conservatively included his career in India where he found much in the native custom and culture to admire. He felt



that a calm devotion to a society which was analagous to a living entity was worth careful study. The liberal tended to think of society as akin to a mere mechanical contrivance. Not that Maine was indifferent to development according to the nature and character of a given society. But he never confused that with the a priori notions of liberal reformers.

Today Acton's attitude seems to have become so general that the philosophic conservative has to steel himself to confess his convictions. I believe that this points to the great if pyrrhic victory of the liberal.

Pyrrhic? Why, again and again the liberal sees his rosy dreams set at nought and this because he has contrived to persuade so many of his case. The victory is gained at too great a cost in that, undisturbed (after a short interval of pain) by set-backs, he continues on a general policy that may remind a conservative of the theories of Swift's Laputans. He refuses to take into account the tragic condition of human life or of what Belloc called the imponderables. He has thought that free trade would make friends of men. He thinks that I may be a Good European through my nation joining the Common Market. He has an ingenuous confidence in Education (with a capital E) and in the human reason. Somewhere Maritain has written of Pascal's "ravaged reason". Maritain is right; but then all our human reason is in some way "ravaged".

This does not, of course, mean that we should not exercise it. But it suggests its partial impotence. The liberal mistakes mere lack of knowledge for so much of human failure. He seems to have transferred what is true enough in one branch of knowledge to that of another. The result is that a liberal will exclaim (as one did a few years ago): "Is it not strange that while men are getting ready to go to the moon, men are killing each other in Cyprus?"

If liberalism continues to hold sway, the cost of its victory and maintenance in power will be intolerable. Perhaps that great if inconsistent Whig, Edmund Burke, has said all this very well. "Politics ought to be adjusted not to human reasonings but to human nature; of which the reason is but a part and by no means the great part."

## CHRISTIAN LIFE

The Jews built a marvellous temple but were told that God would only dwell therein if they amended their behaviour, treated each other fairly, and did not exploit the stranger, the orphan, and the widow. They did not do these things and their temple was turned into a heap of debris. We might take heed.

### “Destroy this Temple . . .”

VINCENT ROCHFORD

**M**EN have always felt impelled to set aside certain spots for their gods. Normally, of course, a building of some sort, made holy by prayer. It was de-secularised, lifted out of the ownership of men, consecrated and made over to the gods. It became the place of meeting between humans and their deities. It was the place par excellence where a man could approach the gods: as it were the earthly dwelling-place of the gods. Indeed there was a certain tension between the two aspects: was it primarily the god's home, or chiefly the meeting-place of his clients? Sometimes one view prevailed—certainly the Greeks built shrines for the gods, normally quite small—sometimes the other—the early Christian generations saw their churches chiefly as settings for their weekly assembly. At all events it is in such sacred buildings that God is thought of as making himself accessible, so that men might worship in those precincts and share his favours and his life.

For the early Hebrews God's presence was revealed by signs, such as the pillar of fire which led them in the desert, or the storm, the thunder, fire and wind around the summit of Sinai. But they longed for a permanent sign of Yahweh's presence, and, his Covenant with them once concluded, they took the visible memorial of this, the stone tablets of the Law he had given them, they constructed an

ark of precious materials, and placed this within a tent, a sacred tent which accompanied them on their wanderings. "And the cloud of Yahweh rested on the tabernacle by day for all the house of Israel to see", the cloud of glory, or shekinah, which was later to rest over their Temple, and be promised by Gabriel to Mary as he announced God's great plan to her. So Israel's sacred place was this nomadic tent, a pilgrim like themselves, during all their lifetime in the wilderness.

### *Holy Places*

Then came the entry into the Promised Land of Canaan, and the long struggle to subjugate the native tribes, two centuries of sporadic warfare. But they felt themselves at last to be settled, and they longed for a permanent central sanctuary for their loose confederation of twelve tribes. They had no form of political union, for it was only in times of stress that the tribes drew close together and lived through their crises under one leader. Yet they hesitated to build a temple for the Ark of the Covenant, for it would resemble too closely the temples of Baal with which the Philistines had so plentifully endowed Palestine when it was theirs. They contented themselves with erecting a shrine in memory of the Covenant, at Gilgal, later at Sichem, finally at Shilo.

Once the task of subjugating their new country was achieved, they had to face external enemies, and were driven to seek more political cohesion. Hence they turned to the system their neighbours had, of kingship; and so Saul was anointed as their first king. His reign was spent in a succession of wars, and much of his great successor's, David's, too. United and free from fears of invasion at last they welcomed their king's choice of Jerusalem as his permanent capital. Here he constructed his royal palace, and would have liked to build a worthy edifice for the Ark of the Covenant. But God did not want it built by him; it fell instead to his son Solomon to undertake the colossal task. No pains were spared in building the new Temple. All local and foreign resources available were laid under contribution.



He employed 30,000 forced labourers, 70,000 porters and 80,000 quarrymen, imported the choicest woods to line the walls, and gold for its heart.

Approached through a porch, the visitor came next to the Sanctuary, the place of sacrifice: further on was the Holy of Holies which housed the Ark, plated in gold, with two great cherubs keeping watch over it. It was consecrated with countless sacrifices: God's cloud of glory hung over the Holy of Holies. Solomon broke out into prayer, "Yahweh has chosen to dwell in a thick cloud. Yes, I have built you a dwelling, a place for you to live in for ever." And he continued, "Will God really live with men on the earth? Why, the heavens cannot contain you: how much less this house that I have built (I Kgs 8:27)? He seemed to receive an answer from God, "My name shall be there."

The pride and wonder of the nation, their Temple was the centre of their worship: here and here alone could sacrifices be offered in honour of God. It was their beloved place of pilgrimage. "How lovely is your dwelling place, Lord, God of hosts . . . One day within your courts is better than a thousand elsewhere," they would sing all over the land (Ps. 83). And the special pilgrim songs:

"I rejoiced when I heard them say,

'Let us go to God's house.'

And now are feet are standing

within your gates, O Jerusalem" (Ps. 121).

Or again, as we used to say at the foot of the altar before Mass:

"Send forth your light and your truth;

let these be my guide.

Let them bring me to your holy mountain,

to the place where you dwell" (Ps. 42).

Often these hymns would have been sung by Jesus and his parents as they made their long journey down from Nazareth on pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

But all this brought its dangers. Official worship tended to degenerate into empty gestures. Temple worship lulled the masses into a superstitious confidence that God owed them his protection however much they might break his

Covenant-law. Prophets might thunder, might warn that authentic worship was of greater importance than any merely material sign of God's presence, that God would abandon them and their Temple be destroyed. "Put no trust in delusive words like these, 'This is the sanctuary of Yahweh ! But if you do amend your behaviour, if you treat each other fairly, if you do not exploit the stranger, the orphan and the widow . . . then here in this place I will stay with you'" (Jer. 7:4).

### *A Church Destroyed, Religion Found*

It was not to be. They were obdurate, and in 587 their city was utterly pillaged, their Temple a heap of debris, themselves away over the desert in a strange land, exiles. Yet it was here, with no Temple in which to worship, that they realised the need to keep alive among them the "wonderful works of God", the memory of his saving power so often exerted in their favour, and of the Covenant which bound them to him. It was during their fifty years of exile that they evolved the worship based on readings of their holy books, with their response of psalm and prayer, which continued after their return as the weekly synagogue worship, and which is preserved today as the Liturgy of the Word in our Mass. It was in exile, deprived of their Temple, that they learned that God is everywhere, especially where he is being adored. The better sections never forgot this lesson, indeed the Essenes practised a spiritual cult without any material signs.

This may lead to examination of conscience among the new People of God. Everywhere in England they are building, building, building. Churches, schools, parochial houses, halls. And some think this is progress.

Let the prophets' warning remind us that Christ is the true Temple in which God and man meet; that we, his People, make him present in our generation and that no buildings can compensate for lack of Christian involvement in the building up of the world and of humanity itself. Needed today or not, the warnings are there, written large and clear.

## CURRENT COMMENT

Instead of taking Christ and His Church as the starting point of their study of community, the Catholic Left begins the other way round. They seek to fashion Christ and Christianity out of community. The result is a mess; the cause of the mess, no real understanding of Grace and its work.

# Letters to the Catholic Left

## 4: Church and Society

### THE EDITOR

Gentlemen,

It seems to me that Eagleton's writing suffers from one basic defect which may be fairly applied, I think, to your own. He has no real understanding of the nature of Grace; no recognition of the significance of the supernatural for mankind. I began to see this with increasing clarity as I worked through the second half of my last letter to yourselves, trying to find out what Eagleton really meant in order that my criticism of his writing should be as fair and as clear as I could possibly make it.

### Recapitulation

In the end, I was left with no alternative but to confront him with the dilemma, which comes out of his essay on "Alienation and Community". Either there is in the world an order of Grace or there is not. If there is, then there exists, thereby, a Christian community. If there is not, no efforts of men can bring one into being. If Eagleton admits to an order of Grace, he must admit to the existence of a community, at least of Rahner's anonymous Christians. He is forced, thereby, to a denial of his main thesis that



Christianity, as the creature of community, is incompatible with contemporary society (which is itself incompatible with community). He is forced, further, to the admission that Christianity can at least coexist with contemporary social order. He is robbed by this admission of his main conclusion, which calls for the overthrow of capitalist society and the identification of Christianity with the socialist society that must supplant it, as alone capable of sustaining genuine (according to Eagleton) community. It is for this reason that I wrote, at the end of my last letter, that, on the most favourable interpretation possible, Eagleton's thesis is revealed as self-contradictory. On the least favourable, which leaves Grace out of account, it must be held to deny Our Lord's Redemption because of its thesis that Christianity can be manufactured by men.

### **A Theology of Dislike**

I do not believe myself that Eagleton holds to either of these positions. He certainly does not deny the Redemption. At the same time, he shows very little understanding of the powerlessness of men without it, of the urgency of their need to experience its effects. He is, I am afraid, without any real grasp of the place of Grace in the lives of men. He sees it as some sort of force, but he rarely relates it to Redemption and there are times in his writing when it takes on an almost entirely naturalistic connotation, as, for example, when he appears to identify it with D. H. Lawrence's spontaneous loving between persons. This, of course, is to make a nonsense of Grace, to desanctify it and rob it entirely of the supernaturalness, which constitutes its essence. Nevertheless, I am quite sure Eagleton believes in it in some sort of way; his assent, however, appears as notional rather than real. I think of him—and yourselves, gentlemen — as very close to the verge of anonymous Christianity, in the Church, certainly, but hardly of it. It may seem strange for me to write this, but I believe your reason for this is that you have an intense dislike, bordering, at times, on the pathological, of its institutional framework and authority. I believe you would repudiate both if you

thought you could so do without denying, thereby, the Redemption. You know you cannot do this and so, whilst barely tolerating the institutional Church and its authority, your efforts are devoted to getting round both, building Christianity without a personal Christ, activating community with a kind of grace-substitute, independent of the sacraments and coming perilously close to identification with mere good-will amongst men. Your theology, in other words, is suited to your dislike of the Church's authority and what I see as at least your incipient, though implicit, desire to be done with it. It is for this reason that you refuse to take the Church as the starting-point of your theological writing, and this is what makes it so fuzzy and confused. Instead of starting with Christ and the revealed certainty of His presence amongst men in the community of His church, you begin with human community out of which, by something close at times to a merely man-made process, you seek to fashion hardly a personal Christ, but Christ as the totem of a new socialist order.

### **Begin with Christ**

Whatever this is, it is not Christianity, even in its anonymous version. It is certainly not the Church, Christ's community on earth which contains within itself the whole of His revelation, His message for mankind. It is precisely Eagleton's failure to start with Christ and the message of His Church that gives your writing so queer a twist. All I can do in the rest of this letter is to make a start from the only point open to me as a Catholic in any discussion of Christianity and community. I have to begin with Christ and his Church and work my way to community, not the other way round. In what follows I will be contrasting the Christian position with that which is merely human in construction and which I will be attributing in this letter to Eagleton and yourselves. I know that, in so doing, I may be attributing to your thought a disregard of Grace and its significance which is not really yours. If I appear unfair in this, I ask your forgiveness. I do so not to take unfair advantage, but in an endeavour to achieve clarity. This

becomes lost if one is forever qualifying every contrast one makes, and I shall have plenty to make in this letter. In any event, I hope what follows will give Eagleton cause to rethink his position, whatever it is, in the realization that his — at the best — semi-supernatural stance, though typically English, is certainly not Christian and is theologically untenable. One cannot remain forever suspended between heaven and earth.

### **Baptism and Grace**

Christianity is the Church, the community of Christians in Christ, made such through the Christ-life that each shares with Christ and so with each other through reception in baptism of the Holy Spirit, the uncreated Grace and dynamic principle of supernatural life. As Charles Davis has put it with splendid clarity in a wonderful little book first published by your firm in 1960:

"By the Resurrection, the outcome of his death, Christ reached the end of his journey back to the Father and entered a new form of existence. The Spirit in Him was released. He himself became so penetrated with the Spirit as to be a life-giving Spirit. From his glorified humanity, there streamed forth the Spirit upon men. There could take place now the movement of which we have spoken. The Spirit flows forth from the risen Christ and as a dynamic principle seizes hold of men and incorporates them into Christ so that they share his life. We become with Christ two in one Spirit. As, when a body grows, the new cells are animated with the life of the whole, so, when we are fitted into Christ and become one with his body, we are animated with his Spirit and live with his life." (1)

We are enabled to love one another as Christ loves us because, through baptism into Christ's Church, we share community in supernatural life. We do not create supernatural life by loving one another. We are enabled to love one another because we have received supernatural life. The

*Cf. Liturgy and Doctrine, p. 33.*

Christian community is grace-full because the Spirit of God is the principle of its life. What appears on one understanding of Eagleton as his purely human community is graceless because, by definition, the Spirit of God is not the principle of its life. Out of it, therefore, neither Christ nor Christian community can come. It is this, I think, that Eagleton does not understand. If by "community" he means a group devoid of grace and sustained only by natural loving, then his "Christianity" is resolved through his misunderstanding of its essence into no more than another species of Arian-Humanism.

### *The Times* and Mr. Billington

Last year, a *Times* correspondent (26/11/66) had the same point to make with regard to a Mr. Ray Billington who, a few days previously had outlined his plans for a "non-Church" in the columns of the same paper. Mr. Billington had defined his basic Christianity (how familiar is this phrase of the pragmatic English!) as "the expression of love (*agape*) in every sphere of life". To which *The Times* correspondent replied in the following terms:

"*Agape* is not just human love, however selfless, but a distinctive and unique love that flows from the Holy Spirit and is God's own love given in Christ to men.

'What Jesus called 'abundant life' is this gift of the Spirit, and he describes it in John 14 where he talks of his imminent death and resurrection as the way he is to pour out his Spirit on his disciples. He breaks bread with them and asks them to repeat the sign in memory of him.

"Part of the early Christian meetings was a 'love supper' which followed the Eucharist. The love and fellowship they expressed in this less formal meal was a sign of the 'abundant life' they had received in the Eucharist.

"Mr. Billington is right when he sees Christianity as going beyond mere credal formulas, but it is even more than the lived formula, it is a living community founded on the living Christ, which is fed and made visible in the celebration of the Eucharist and its new divine life is seen in the lives of its members."



## One thing is Certain

I would agree with the whole substance of this extraordinarily clear piece of writing. If I had to make a change, it would be to call *agape* a distinctive and unique quality in love, rather than a love distinctive in itself. I would do this because, for me, grace adds to nature by way of enrichment rather than multiplication. It does not give a man two lives, but changes the quality of that which he has. But these emendations do not affect the substantive excellence of the passage just quoted. They in no way detract from its chief merit which is to point, as one of kind, the difference between the life of Grace and that of unaided nature. Whether this latter be possible or not (in view of what modern theologians have to say of an order of grace whose dissemination is not only through baptism, but in other ways best known to God) one thing is absolutely certain; Christianity is a living community whose members are joined in the living Christ. Whether there be an anonymous Christianity or not, one thing above all is certain and that is the certainty of the community of the baptised in Christ; which makes me wonder all the more why a baptised Catholic like Eagleton should not take its existence as the starting point of his theological speculations. Why does he discard a pearl of such price and go grubbing instead for his Lord and Master as a product of meetings amongst men? What makes him, as a Catholic, look outside the baptised to a human community of, at the best, anonymous Christians in the hope of finding amongst them the Christ of the Christian community? Possibly, because Eagleton would like, in this way, to identify community which, for him, is Christianity, with the whole of human kind, thereby emphasising the need for the transformation of society into Socialism, so that Christian community may be born and Christ take shape (like some sort of totem) amongst men.

## Task of the Church

The Christian community—by which I mean from now on the community of the baptised, which is the Catholic Church—is not conterminous with human society, though the mission

of the Church is indeed to make it so. The method is not, as one interpretation of Eagleton would lead us to believe, that of (impossibly) manufacturing a totem-Christ out of a grace-less community brought into being through the transformation of existing social relationships. The method is that of drawing men to Christ and their incorporation in Him through baptism, which gives them a share in His life as members of His Church whose task is to further the action in history of His Father, God. Saint John has described the task of the Church with beauty and simplicity. It is to "gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad" (11:52). A Jesuit, Father John Courtney Murray has phrased it finely in a magisterial article (6), which I would commend to the close attention of Eagleton and yourselves:

"Regarded as a functional community, however, the Church is not an end in itself but a means to a higher end—its own growing self-realization as an interpersonal community. There will come a day when the Messianic function of the Church will have been finished—the Day of the Lord, when the gathering of the People will be complete and the reign of Christ definitively established: 'Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father' (1 Cor. 15:24)."

### **A Church of Pilgrims**

The eschatological note of the Church is here clearly sounded: as Christians, we are to live in the expectation of Christ's coming. The Christian community's place is not here on the earth forever, as you, gentlemen, would appear to have it be with your identification of Christianity as Socialism and your heaven, apparently, a workers' paradise. The Catholic Church, if I may quote Father Courtney Murray once again, is an "eschatological reality in a temporal realization thereof", a pilgrim people on the way to God. Whilst on this earth, the Christian seeks fulfilment in Christ

(6) "Freedom, Authority, Community" in *America* for December 3rd, 1966.

through his brethren in the Christian community of which baptism has made him a member. For he is, indeed, not only an individual person, but a social being, a community man. His Christian Faith does not make him an island. Neither—if I may remind you of the second syllogism of your thesis set out in my previous letter—does it view him, in himself, as a merely conceptual abstraction, unmade outside community; a view quite false and owing more to Marx than to Christ. The Church regards man rightly as all-important in himself, but needing the society of others for his fulfilment as a person. The Church teaches further that fulfilment can never be made complete on this earth because the life we share now with Christ is destined to find consummation only beyond the grave. Death, for the Christian, is the gateway to life. The union in love for which he is destined with Christ in God has a beginning here on earth in baptism. After the pass-over we call death it is taken to heights undreamt of. Even so, final fulfilment comes only with the second coming of Christ, the *parousia* to which the first Christians looked forward with such eager anticipation. Charles Davis has described all this finely and with great clarity (7). I make no excuse for quoting him at some length:

“We should live in the expectation of the coming of Christ and all that this will bring. Surprising though it may seem, we should want the end of the world and look forward to it. It is an object of our hope. The early Christians longed for it and were impatient at its delay. But for them, unlike ourselves, the end of the world was not a final catastrophe, whether a natural disaster or one due to the folly of men, but the triumph of Christ. This will come about by a free intervention of God.

“The death and resurrection of Christ already mark the beginning of the end of the world. By those saving acts Christ introduced the final order of things into this world and into human history. The new creation has begun. We already have eternal life. We enjoy already the life of

(7) *Liturgy and Doctrine*, p. 91.

the world to come. We live in the last days. No wonder the first Christians were impatient for everything to be settled quickly. But the ascension of Christ and the promise of his return made it clear that, contrary to what many had thought, the end of the world would come about in two stages.

"The present age is the first stage. The final order of things now exists, fully in Christ himself, but only in a hidden, incomplete way in the rest of creation. This is an intermediate period. The reason for such a period is to give men the opportunity of associating themselves freely with the new creation and co-operating with its gradual penetration into the world. When all is ready, at a time known only to God, Christ will come again. His return will mark the second and ultimate stage.

"The second coming of Christ will bring into the open the new order that now lies hidden. It will show the meaning of human history and how God has been present in it, directing it to his purpose. Christ will bring all to completion. His return is the end of the world. It is the end, not in the sense of the destruction of all, but in the sense of the final fulfilment of all. By it will be achieved all that God has set out to do when he created this universe and man, all that he planned when he sent Christ to save man, and the universe with man. All that is good and valuable in creation and human history will be taken up into the final order. Nothing except sin will be excluded. Such will be the triumph of Christ. It is the reason why God created this world and the end towards which he is directing all things."

### **Aggiornamento and Mission**

Until the time, then, of the second coming of Christ, the Church on earth can have no abiding city. The people of God are pilgrims. Does this mean that the Christian need have nothing to do with society, that he can remain through life in a state of toffee-nosed, non-commitment to his fellow-men? To draw this conclusion would be to forget that the Church has a mission, splendidly described by Father



Courtney Murray in the article to which I have already made reference:

"Precisely as an interpersonal communion of love, the Church has a service (*diakonia*) to perform toward all humanity. That is to say, the divine love that is the form of the People (of God) reaches out through the People, in witness (*martyrion*), to draw all men into the communion of love, so that they may participate in the response of faith and love to the love whereby the Father loves His own People, purchased by the blood of His Son. In other words, precisely as an inter-personal community *sui generis*, the Church is also a functional community, that is, a community with a work to do, an action to perform—the action of God in history, which is to 'gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad' (John 11:52). Moreover, the work of the community, which is a work of love, is not extrinsic to the thematic of the community; it is woven, as it were, into this thematic as an essential element of it. That is to say, the interpersonal community, united in love, is also united by the missionary work of love to which it is called by its very nature."

It is to this work, intrinsic to its nature, that the Church—the community of Christians in Christ—has been called anew by the second Vatican Council. The whole purpose of the *aggiornamento*, of which you, gentlemen, take so little account in what you write, is to reshape the Church in the context of the modern world for the more apt fulfilment of its missionary task. The Christian community is *in via*, on its way, its members subject, therefore, to the inevitable tensions which must arise from the two-way pull—towards Heaven and earth—which accompanies it on its journey. Christians are in the world, but not of it. Their life as a community is not apart from that of the world or even parallel to it, but in its midst. The temptation to seek a self-contained existence has afflicted them in one form or another since the foundation of their Church. So, too, has that which bids them identify themselves with human society, forgetting the transcendental nature of their vocation, and

confusing the full living of their Faith with any of so many forms of humane do-gooding. The Christian vocation lies in neither of these directions. It is essentially a work not of humanism, but divine love; by which I mean that the Christ-like love which binds Christians in Christ must, of its very nature, flow through their doing in witness, so that all may be drawn to share, through baptism, that life in Christ, which is the heritage of the Christian community.

### Vocation and Fulfilment

In the transmission of this love to those about him, the Christian finds, at one and the same time, vocation and fulfilment in Christ. The two are inseparable. He cannot himself draw closer to Christ without enriching, thereby, the lives of others: by the same count, he cannot enrich their lives unless he himself draws closer to Christ in love. The Christian community is fulfilled through the fulfilment of its members in the accomplishment of their task, which is to bring Christ to men. What signalizes its effort and distinguishes it from mere humanitarianism is its inspiration which is Christ and its object which is to give Christ's love to others through each of a whole field of varied activities. Christianity, I once said, is the spilling over into the concrete of the charity of Christ. For the Christian community now, as in Saint Paul's day, it is a case of "*Caritas Christi urget nos*": His love, received in baptism, must be the ground of all our doing. This is precisely what sanctification means. To be true to himself, the Christian must be a Christopher, a bearer of Christ to others. In this essential sense, his vocation remains the same yesterday, today and tomorrow. It can never change.

All this might be put more succinctly by saying that the Christian task is to extend the order of Grace. It would be quite wrong, of course, to think of this process as somehow segregating for the Church an empire out of non-Christian society, a sort of spiritual *apartheid*; seeing Christianity as some kind of enclave, which has to be widened at the expense of a secular world. The imagery is wrong here, I think, and pictures the Church's mission as

one of pulling men out of their natural lives into some sort of artificial existence alien to their true selves, disembodimenting them, so to say, in order to make them true Christians. To think in those terms is to forget that Grace is not so much a consecration, with its note of withdrawal, as a sanctification, with its note of enrichment. Its task is not to violate nature, but to make it whole; not to replace the ordinary process of human development, but to transform and complete it. Grace does not denature man. It adds lustre to all he does. It is no paradox, therefore, to say that the fulfilment of a human being is inconceivable without its *suprahuman* action. Grace is a field in flower, but you cannot have the flowers without the field. Grace builds on and through nature; never in spite of it. Christianity, therefore, is not and never can be alien to this world. It is, in fact, its essential complement, the one thing the world needs most if it is to come to life; for the world can be fulfilled—which means that men can fulfil themselves—only in Christ.

### Church and Society

The penetration of the world by Christ is a penetration of the whole man, body as well as soul, his environment, therefore, as well as himself. The socio-political order is within the compass of the Church's mission in so far as its shape is subjected to—affected by—the grace-enriched actions of members of the Christian community in their capacity as citizens. The Christian does not shed his Christianity when he enters the world of his working day (in which most of his life is spent) any more than when he enters the world of his family day. He is enriched, not denatured by Grace. His actions, therefore, are meant to carry the impress of Christ in boardroom and on factory floor; in short, his working life is to be ruled by Christian values. This is what Christian love commands—the enrichment with Grace of human society; which means the application of Christian values to public life. It is through the work of the individual committed Christian in this regard that the charity of Christ, which must be the motive-force of his loving and doing, flows over into the concrete world of his daily

experience. Christ-like love is both cause and effect of his actions, giving motive and enrichment to his activity and leaving its impress on his actual accomplishments; sanctifying the Christian and his works in this sense, that, whilst his own life is enriched through Christ-like activity, the world of his working day is better shaped, thereby, to the needs of human fulfilment, which, we have seen above, must be the work of Grace. A full *human* life is one enriched by Grace, in which *supernatural* life is shared with others in Christ. Man cannot draw the best out of himself apart from the Christian community, taken here to mean not only the community of the baptised, but anonymous Christians also; all who, in some way or other, are open to Grace. These shape and are shaped by their environment. They are not made by it, as you, gentlemen, appear to think. Man is not the product of community, the creature of relationships within it as Marx and yourselves would have us believe. Man *makes* community, but is affected by it. His task as a Christian is so to shape his socio-political surroundings—to enable Christ, through his efforts, to affect them in such a way—that, within the world they constitute, Grace will be able to accomplish its work of human fulfilment.

The enrichment of the world by Grace, its santification, entails more, of course, than the permeation of its socio-political structure with Christian values, the shaping of its institutions by Christians in a Christian, that is, a Christ-like direction. Other subsidiary operations have also to be undertaken. I am aware of this; and I have been content in what I have just written to emphasize a relationship—between Christianity and society—still disregarded, because largely unknown, by the vast majority of Christians.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Crane, S.J.



Criticism in the right spirit of any institution is an essential part of maturity. We do not criticise when we are children because we do not know enough, we do not understand. Later on we do and it is our job to say what we think is wrong. In the Chinese phrase "we should not remove the fly from our mother's forehead with a chopper" but we should remove it all the same. If it can be shown that what we think is a fly is really a beauty spot we should of course desist.

## Criticism and Authority

E. L. WAY

A GREAT deal depends upon what is being criticised. For example quite recently a Mr. David Arthur Hill, of Bilston, Staffordshire, a secretary and director of John Thomas Ltd., died and left the workers of the firm in Wolverhampton £20,000. Here was an almost unique employer: one who obviously realised that it was his work-people who were mainly responsible for his estate of £244,640 (duty paid £142,812). Now it would certainly be contemptible of any worker to be critical of such a just supervisor. The workers owe such a man loyalty. And when one owes loyalty to a man, or a country, or one's family, or to a cherished institution, or one's church the words of criticism one uses are very carefully picked indeed. A Catholic would justly be condemned if he publicly criticised a priest for rudeness. One keeps such things for the household of the faith; they are swept, so to speak, under the ecclesiastical carpet.

### *Men and Institutions*

And one must distinguish further between the criticism

of men, and the criticism of an institution. For example, a child is taken ill. The doctor is called in, and is puzzled, and not very clear in his diagnosis, and ends by saying that he will come again in the evening. After he goes the child gets steadily worse. The pain in his right side becomes alarming. Now if the father had said, "Medicine is a waste of time, doctors are idiots, and the National Health Service ought to be scrapped," he would obviously have been talking nonsense. If, however, as happened in the case cited, the father said, "I don't like the look of this. I think the doctor is a fool," and then rang for an ambulance, stating that he believed that his son had an appendicitis which required immediate attention, he clearly acted sensibly. The boy was taken to hospital and operated on successfully. The father was right in his diagnosis, and the doctor was an ass.

### *Religious Counterpart*

Similarly parents can take their children to a 'family service' during Holy Week, and find the priest incompetent and in a tearing hurry. As a result 'The Stations' are run through at high speed, the English is barely understood by the adults, and is totally incomprehensible to the congregated infants for whom it was specially announced. Afterwards the parents exchanged opinions on the 'service', with the children well out of the way. And agreed upon the following points: (1) the 'service' was a purely routine, almost meaningless, function, (2) the parents could have quite easily arranged something at home more suited to the needs of the children, (3) the sacred hymn *Stabat Mater* was turned into a shambles, and an English version should be used, (4) a specially designed service for young children should be imposed by central authority upon those unwilling, incapable, or with insufficient time to prepare one for themselves, (5) next year there will be no repetition of this experience. Discreet enquiries will be made in plenty of time as to which parish 'family service' is worth attending.

How unfavourably all this compared with the eating of the Passover meal which the parents, aided and urged on by their eldest son, go through reverently each year. The lamb, the

bitter herbs (watercress), unleavened bread and wine, the dates, and the readings of the explanatory and appropriate texts by even the youngest in the family make a profound impression. But this was the work of devoted amateurs. The church 'family service' was the work of a stale professional, and the impression was not only saddening but disturbing.

### *Tibetan Prayer Wheels*

As the Mass is usually said with reverence, and the readings of the epistles and gospels and other prayers have improved with the introduction of lay readers, why cannot there be an equal improvement in other services and 'devotions'? (Some may disagree about the lay readers. Occasionally they make mistakes, sometimes grotesque mistakes, but where you get a really good one the reading all round improves.) Laymen and lay women are often profoundly shocked at the way many services are rushed through. Non-catholics are frequently disgusted, and are quite blunt in telling you so. Very often it is a question of five laps round the block. And the sooner it is over the better. No wonder fewer people are turning up to these services. Prayer is defined as the raising up of the mind and heart to God. It is extremely difficult to locate the heart in such exercises. While the mind is frequently absent. These purely mechanical routines, these soulless and mindless performances, would be insults to God if there was anything conscious or deliberate about them. As it is one feels that these Tibetan prayer wheel activities have but a limited future. People are voting on them by their absence. Benediction, though a very different matter, the Sacred Host always being elevated and adored with appropriate reverence, could also be extended to include scripture readings with intelligent commentaries. This is already being done in some churches, but will take some time to reach the theologically comatose suburbs. And the priests are already overburdened performing their vital functions: that is sending out teams for the planned giving, and organising the covenant schemes, etc., etc.

## Old Attitudes

And some of the outrageous old habits still linger. I have heard a priest call out for the door at the back of the church to be closed. He was not heard. (He will not use a loudspeaker.) In a most irritable tone he repeated his order. But still was not heard. He finally screamed out his demand as if those congregated by the door were idiots. (The church was packed for first Communions.) The door was hastily closed. Apart from prisons and the parade ground, there is no sphere of life in which a man would long be permitted so to conduct himself. In no other sphere of life would he have obtained the power to play so completely the insulting role of autocrat. But he has a reputation in the neighbourhood for his rudeness and intransigence. And yet when it comes to meeting Cardinal Heenan he is full of charm and blarney, and cannot get out sufficient "Your Eminences". The laity *could* put an end to such behaviour in a month.

## Criticism and Society

If catholics put up with such behaviour, and have been taught to revere without discrimination all those set in authority over them, no matter how outrageously some of them may behave, it is not much use lamenting that they will not stand up and fight for Christian values, nor strive to bring about a Christian society. To stand up and be counted calls for attributes of courage and of independence of mind. We have to think long and carefully, weigh what the Church says with the utmost respect, and then be in a position to act. At particular moments in history the man of independent mind and heroic courage steps forward. Such a man was Thomas More. Father Philip Hughes in his book *The Reformation* wrote: "And, like the parochial clergy, the religious orders took the oath *en masse*. Prelates, secular and regular, had the special distinction that they each signed a declaration of their repudiation of the traditional faith—namely, a declaration that "the Bishop of Rome has not, in Scripture, any greater jurisdiction in this kingdom of England, than any other foreign bishop." The actual document survives, to this day a startling witness in its stark



simplicity, of their wholesale, cowardly apostasy" (p.172 Universe Edition). But Thomas More, the layman, would not do what "all the bishops, and the best learned in this realm have done," he would not take the oath, charitably explaining that "a weak clergy lacked grace to stand by their learning". After he was condemned to death he explained that a national hierarchy was not to be obeyed when it went against the rest of Christendom, and against what the Councils had taught for a thousand years. Happily such occasions when a man is in conscience bound to reject the views of a section of the Church are very rare. But they do occur, especially when national hierarchies are being set up by governments whose political philosophies are opposed to the Church.

### *Passing Moral Conventions*

That those who speak authoritatively in the name of the Church can be as blind as the age in which they live is abundantly clear from history. Harking back once again to the period of St. Thomas More, we can refresh our memories with but one detail of the barbaric legal punishments which existed at the time, and were strongly upheld by the Church. St. John Fisher's cook, a man unknown to fame for it is not certain whether his name was Rouse or Rice, was a poisoner and he was, by the order of the Sheriff, boiled alive in a cauldron, which was lowered up and down on a chain, to help him to stew better. It was a fantastically cruel age; the horrific details are too well known to need an airing. And yet no one asked if it was against the natural law to boil a man alive; one thing was certain: poisoning was not to be encouraged and that was that.

Every age has its blindspots. Our own is no exception. Are we as Christians unduly worried by the slaughter on the roads? If transport could be improved greatly by boiling pedestrians rather than by knocking them down we would certainly boil them. People who can see beyond the horizon of their epoch will always be necessary, that much is certain.

## MONTHLY REPORT

Student demonstrations are part of the international scene. Up till now England has not seen many of them. In this article we note that the communists have got into the N.U.S., and are seeking to widen the front of that body's activities. It should "involve itself in industrial and political action and not 'stay in its cosy little world of education'".

# Students in Turmoil: Partial Background

## 1: Radical Students Alliance

OBSERVER

THE Radical Student Alliance was launched on 3rd October, 1966 by twelve students, including two members each of the Communist, Labour and Liberal student organisations. At a press conference at the Liberal Party headquarters Christopher Farrer, chairman of the Manchester regional committee of the National Union of Students said:

"that the alliance wished to pursue more militant policies than those of the present executive of the N.U.S. But he stressed: 'We are not a rival organisation and we intend to work through the normal apparatus of the N.U.S.'." (1)

### A manifesto

A manifesto was distributed to universities and colleges inviting student groups to associate themselves with the aims of the Alliance. Its main points include:

"1. Students' rights: students should have the right to complete control over their own unions and funds, to elect

their officers and representatives to determine their own policies, and to study free from financial barriers.

2. Education: education must be classless, integrated and comprehensive at all levels. Adequate remuneration to secure a sufficient supply of teaching staff must not be delayed by the wage freeze; college authorities should be more democratically composed to include representatives of students, non-professorial staff and trade unions.

3. Students and Society: students must be able to take collective action on matters of general social concern. There should be active co-operation with students in other countries and in particular solidarity with victims of oppression." (1)

Among the founder members of the Alliance were Terry Lacey, the vice-chairman of the Young Liberals, Alan Hunt, a Communist from Leeds, and David Adelstein, president of the Students' Union at the London School of Economics.

2. The inaugural conference of the R.S.A. was held on 28-29th January, 1967 at the London School of Economics, and was attended by about 300 students from more than 100 colleges and universities. The topics to be discussed were set out in the manifesto, but the R.S.A. also seized on another issue on which to gather support. This was the Government's decision to raise the fees for overseas students, an issue on which the R.S.A. accuses the N.U.S. of being inadequately militant. According to *The Observer* of 29th January, "The rise in fees for overseas students has given the R.S.A. its first big opportunity to measure its strength against the N.U.S. leadership".

On this issue the R.S.A. is supported by the Co-ordinating Committee of Overseas Student Organisations, a body formed at about the same time as the R.S.A. last October, by about twenty of the overseas national student bodies in London. It has its headquarters at 3, Shavers Place, Haymarket, London S.W.1., premises which it shares with the pro-Communist Iraqi Students' Society and the pro-Trotskyist Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation.

"The secretary is Miss Nichola Seyd, a 30-year-old English girl who for two years worked in Prague for the

International Union of Students, the Communist-dominated organisation from which the N.U.S. withdrew in 1950." (2)  
—Miss Seyd joined the Communist Party in 1957. (3)

3. At the inaugural meeting of the R.S.A. an informal constitution was adopted and a council of twenty was elected. According to the *Daily Mail* of 3rd February, of the thirty-two candidates, nine were Communists of whom five were elected. Fergus Nicholson, the Communist Party's full-time National Student Organiser, whom *The Observer* of 29th January described as being "somewhere in the background", named these five

"Mr. Phil Goodwin, of University College, whose father was said by the Prime Minister last year to have influenced the seamen's strike;

Mr. Martin Jacques, third year economics student at Manchester University;

Mr. Digby Jacks, part-time research zoologist at Woolwich Polytechnic;

Mr. Mick Weiss, vice-president of Aston (Birmingham) University Students' Union, studying social science;

Mr. Brian Grogan, third year philosophy and politics student at Keel University.

Another council member, Mr. David Mitton, admits to 'Communist leanings'.

He was formerly at High Wycombe Technical College and now works as an assistant director at AP film studios . . ." (4)

The Conference decided to organise a mass demonstration and lobby of Parliament to protest against increased fees for overseas students, on 1st February, when the N.U.S. had itself arranged to hold a smaller protest meeting in Caxton Hall. It also decided to hold a mass meeting on the same issue in Trafalgar Square on 22nd February and possibly a strike by student unions on the same day, and to organise another lobby, this time to demand higher salaries for teachers, on 1st March.

4. The size and influence of the R.S.A. have increased rapidly since it was started, but there has always been internal friction. In its first week, one of the founder

members, Christopher Farrer, "indicated his intention of withdrawing from the 'Radical Student Alliance' because he now believes it to be a 'Trotskyist front'." (5).

After being elected to the council in January, Anna Ford, President of Manchester University, resigned according to the *Daily Mail* of 3rd February 'because of the Communist influence'. The *Daily Telegraph* of 7th February said that the R.S.A. council was discussing ways and means of expelling its five Communists but two days later it reported that the R.S.A. had decided against this. Terry Lacey said in a letter to his university members: "Personally I am opposed to actually kicking the Commies out of R.S.A. because I prefer to have them where I can see them, but it does worry me to go to meetings which have more C.P. members than everyone else." (6)

### Widening front

5. Although the R.S.A. has always insisted that it is not a rival to the N.U.S., "one after another, prominent figures in the student world got up at the R.S.A. inaugural conference to reject the basic N.U.S. philosophy that it should limit itself to taking action only on narrow educational issues. The National union, said . . . Mr. David Widgery, should . . . involve itself in industrial and political action, and not 'stay in its cosy little world of education'. Liberal students' leader Mr. Terry Lacey told the meeting that the time had come for the union to throw out its present constitution which barred all political discussions . . . The union should fight for T.U.C. affiliation . . . so that it could take its place in the struggle to right the many wrongs of our society . . ." (7)

The N.U.S. sent a circular letter to all constituent unions at the beginning of February warning them against involvement with the R.S.A. For each union, the position is now clear—it can no longer protest its loyalty to the N.U.S. whilst at the same time supporting R.S.A. policies. Already a few unions, among them Salford College of Advanced Technology and Essex University have disaffiliated themselves from the N.U.S. This action, however, is strongly



opposed by the R.S.A. because it hopes eventually to take over a united national students' union and because these unions will not be able to vote with the R.S.A. against the executive line at the next N.U.S. Council, which will be held in Liverpool from 30th March to 4th April, 1967.

6. At the Easter Council, the R.S.A. will have its first opportunity to test its power inside the N.U.S. during the elections for new executive committee members. It has already won considerable support during its short existence, helped particularly by the publicity achieved by its protests against Government policy on overseas students' fees, a matter of genuine concern to students. The N.U.S. having first advocated moderation, has itself been forced, by the refusal of the Secretary of State for Education to reconsider his decision, to adopt a more militant position, and can thus be made to appear merely to be following the R.S.A.'s lead. On the other hand recent events at the London School of Economics, when a porter died during a student demonstration, and the part played in them by David Adelstein, one of the leading members of R.S.A. has roused public opinion which normally takes very little interest in internal student politics. Adelstein's personal popularity has undoubtedly suffered, and many students may now doubt the wisdom of pursuing the militant course advocated by the R.S.A. Moreover the R.S.A. itself is faced with the usual student apathy which even recent events have not shaken. One result of a union's disaffiliation from the N.U.S. which effects the majority of students personally is the loss of various travel facilities and concessions. This, from the point of view of the individual student is the most valuable part of membership of the N.U.S.; the militant unions may find it necessary to remain in the N.U.S. when the majority of their members realise the price of disaffiliation.

7. As an article in the *Sunday Telegraph* of 5th February showed, student dissatisfaction and attacks on the N.U.S. leadership are recurring phenomena. Describing events twenty years ago when the London School of Economics was under the control of the extreme left-wing, it commented: "Communist control was based on student indifference.

When students were brought to realise that Communist antics were getting the college a bad name, a Labour-led campaign swept them and their 'cover-men' right out of office . . . As one observer put it: 'Student Marxism contains the seeds of its own destruction'. The mass lobbying by the 'Red Guards' by reaching the headlines had destroyed their main asset, student indifference." (1)

There are, however, new factors in the present situation. For the first time there is a possibility of militant student action on a large scale in this country, and the R.S.A. is an integral part of the student syndicalist movement which is emerging in Western Europe and North America.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (1) <i>Morning Star</i> , October 4, 1966.      | (5) <i>The Guardian</i> , October 11, 1966.     |
| (2) <i>The Observer</i> , January 29, 1967.     | (6) <i>Sunday Times</i> , February 5, 1967.     |
| (3) <i>Evening Standard</i> , February 4, 1967. | (7) <i>Morning Star</i> , January 30, 1967.     |
| (4) <i>Daily Mail</i> , February 3, 1967.       | (8) <i>Sunday Telegraph</i> , February 5, 1967. |

---

## *Two Different Standards*

"My brothers, do not try to combine faith in Jesus Christ, our glorified Lord, with the making of distinctions between classes of people. Now suppose a man comes into your synagogue, beautifully dressed and with a gold ring on, and at the same time a poor man comes in, in shabby clothes, and you take notice of the well-dressed man, and say, 'Come this way to the best seats'; then you tell the poor man, 'Stand over there' or 'You can sit on the floor by my footrest'. Can't you see that you have used two different standards in your mind, and turned yourselves into judges, and corrupt judges at that?" Letter of St. James, 2, 1-4 (The Jerusalem Bible).

## INDUSTRIAL ANGLE

After the period of freeze and severe restraint, we have been informed by the Government as to what its ideas are on incomes policy in the coming year. These have been set forth in the White Paper. Four criteria are recognised as justifying pay increases. Dr. Jackson examines them, and also deals with productivity, and the degree of coercion which may be needed to make the incomes policy work.

# Incomes Policy: The Second Year

J. M. JACKSON

WHEN the Government was forced by the deteriorating economic system to introduce a wage freeze in the summer of 1966, it was admitting, in effect, that it had failed to secure the acceptance of an adequate voluntary incomes policy in time to be of use. At the time the crisis measures were taken, there was a general assumption that the Government would seek to establish an early warning system that would require prior notification of intended wages claims and price increases. It was not expected, however, that the Government would assume powers other than to require a short delay in order to refer a case, if it thought fit, to the Prices and Incomes Board. In the event, it took powers to enable it to compel employers to withhold wages increases that had already been agreed with the unions, even in those cases where the employer had a legal obligation to pay the increased wage.\*

\*Usually, a bargain between the employers' association and the trade unions is not a legally enforceable contract. It is possible, however, that the terms so agreed in fact become implicit terms in the contract between the individual workman and his employer: it may be written into the contract of employment that the employer will pay the wages so agreed.

The Government handled the situation badly. It tried to force employers to break the law by withholding increases they were legally bound to pay. It may certainly be argued that it is preferable to have a voluntary incomes policy than one which rests upon Government coercion. Nevertheless, where there is a legal obligation that could be enforced by any individual worker who cared to do so, or by the trade unions on behalf of their members, it is wrong that the Government should try to persuade employers to break the law. In this kind of situation, the Government should openly use its powers to make an order prohibiting the payment of the higher wages.

### ***Severe Restraint***

The *Freeze* of the second half of 1966 gave way, in the first half of 1967, to *Severe Restraint*. During this period, most increases continued to be banned, though some increases already agreed but caught by the *freeze* were allowed. Increases were also permitted in a limited number of instances to very poorly paid workers (though these were never officially defined) and to workers entering into certain productivity agreements. In the latter case, stringent conditions were laid down. There is no need to list these conditions in detail, but it is worth noting some of the points that had to be considered. There were to be no increases before greater productivity had been achieved, some benefit should accrue to the community at large in reduced prices, and the increases should not be so large as to cause unrest among those who were still denied any increase.

The twelve months of *freeze* and *severe restraint* created some anomalies. In industry, workers in the higher echelons are usually paid a salary that is subject to annual review. Unlike civil servants and teachers, these workers are not assured of annual increments under their contracts, but in practice receive annual increases related to their efficiency and the level of work they are doing. Under this system, an able man will be given an increase in pay, perhaps a generous one, in recognition of the fact that he has done his work well and that he can be entrusted with work of increas-

ing importance and difficulty. The less able man, on the other hand, will find that he gets no increase at all under this system. In teaching or the civil service, the same increase will be given to a man whether he is able or incompetent (unless, of course, he is so bad that he is dismissed). The industrial system is clearly a better one, but during the period of *freeze* and *severe restraint* business executives were denied the benefits of these salary reviews while those on incremental salary scales continued to receive their increments.

One may feel that at a time of crisis, all should make equal sacrifices. This might suggest that increments should not have been paid to teachers and civil servants, rather than that the business executive should continue to benefit from salary reviews. This is a mistaken view, however. It is quite wrong to equate these increases in pay of the higher echelons in business with the pay increases negotiated for the rank and file workers. A manual worker transferred to a job that carried a higher rate of pay would get the appropriate increase in pay. Where the actual work done by a man in one of the higher grades had changed, he was denied any recompense for this.

### *The Coming Year*

The Government has now published a White Paper setting out its ideas on incomes policy in the period beginning in July 1967, when *severe restraint* ends.\* It is really proposing that there should be a return to the criteria that were to have formed the basis of the policy that was being evolved before the *freeze*. There are four criteria that are recognised as justifying pay increases above the norm (which will for the coming twelve months be zero):

1. where workers make a *direct contribution* by harder work or accepting changed working practices to increased productivity in the firm or industry;
2. where it is essential in the national interests to bring about a change in the distribution of manpower, *providing that higher pay will in fact help to achieve this object*;

\*Prices and Incomes Policy after 30th June, 1967, Cmnd.3235.



3. where wages are too low for the workers to maintain a reasonable standard of living; and

4. where pay is seriously below that of those doing similar work *and needs in the national interest to be increased*. While all four criteria are accepted as justifying increases in the coming twelve months, the Government (and the T.U.C. also) are clearly thinking in terms of priority being given to the lowly paid workers and to workers entering into productivity agreements. The Government is aware, too, that attempts might be made to overcome the limitations imposed by the incomes policy by submitting wage claims at shorter intervals. It is proposing therefore that for the future at least twelve months should elapse between wage claims. It suggests, too, that there are cases where an adjustment should be made in stages in order to bring about a substantial increase in remuneration. (This is a difficult idea to sell, however, because workers who are now badly paid in relation to others doing similar work may feel that if in the immediate future they only make up a little of the leeway, they will not make up any more when conditions relax still more and everybody starts getting something like a 3 per cent norm.)

In general, increases which have been held back may be paid from 1st July, and adjustments of individual salaries may again be made where there is no formal incremental scale, though the Government stresses that this relaxation should not be abused and the general level of remuneration of certain groups increased under the guise of individual adjustment.

### *How much coercion?*

The big question in the coming year is how far it is possible to rely upon a voluntary incomes policy and what degree of coercion the Government ought to retain. The T.U.C. has shown that it is anxious to operate its own incomes policy, but the Government is unwilling to rely solely upon this and is anxious to keep certain reserve powers. Some reserve powers may be needed in so far as certain groups of workers may not belong to unions affiliated to the

T.U.C. Apart from this case, however, there are arguments for and against the retention of reserve powers by the Government.

There are obvious objections to trying to operate any kind of incomes policy in the face of hostile groups of organised workers. Such a policy is bound to create a great deal of friction and this in itself cannot be for the good of the economy. Nevertheless, in some circumstances, this might be the lesser evil. One cannot reasonably say that the Government should sit back and let the old pattern of collective bargaining re-assert itself and force wages and prices steadily upwards. The Government has a clear duty to stop inflation and if necessary it must use whatever coercion is necessary. If unions and employers act irresponsibly, the blame must rest on them for the necessity to use coercion and for the friction that results.

If the T.U.C. is genuinely anxious to operate a voluntary incomes policy, it should be given the opportunity to make it work. Nevertheless, freedom to try and operate a voluntary policy does not mean that the Government should stand completely aside until it has been demonstrated that such a policy does not work. That course could be disastrous for the economy, and might well necessitate a re-imposition of the earlier *freeze*. The Government must retain sufficient powers to ensure that it can take effective action in the event of the voluntary policy proving ineffective.

The idea of the T.U.C. would appear to be something on these lines. Member unions would be required to notify the T.U.C. of the claims they were making, and if the T.U.C.'s own vetting committee thought these were unreasonable, the unions would be expected to modify them. It must be remembered, however, that the T.U.C. has no real authority in this matter. If the T.U.C. disapproves of a claim, it has no power to force the union concerned to withdraw it. Indeed, it cannot even compel the individual unions to notify it of the claims they are making, and it is as yet, by no means certain that all unions will be willing to co-operate.

It would be a mistake to assume that so long as the

majority of unions co-operated, all would be well. In a sense, it would be correct to make this assumption. If the great majority of unions operated this voluntary incomes policy, the rate of increases in the total wage bill would be kept well under control. But if one or two important unions refused to co-operate and succeed in securing substantial wage increases from employers, it clearly becomes unrealistic to expect the majority of unions to continue operating the voluntary policy, and indeed it would be unfair to expect them to do so. It is only too easy to see that they could not long allow their members' living standards to fall relatively to those of unions which did not co-operate.

It is to prevent this kind of situation disrupting the voluntary policy that reserve powers are needed by the Government. Basically, these powers will require the Government to be notified also of wage claims, and in appropriate cases to allow a reference to be made to the Prices and Incomes Board. Where a reference is made to the Board, an increase might be ruled out until the Board has reported. Such measures are essentially delaying measures and their value would depend upon the exact amount of the delay that could be enforced. It certainly represents the minimum that is needed to ensure that the voluntary system does not break down completely if it does not receive complete support from the trade union movement.

### ***Productivity***

It is widely believed that increased productivity is the way out of our present economic difficulties, and that therefore productivity bargaining is to be encouraged. The first part of the proposition is valid enough. Increased productivity is essential if we are to raise our own standard of living more rapidly and at the same time be in a position to give increased help to the poorer countries of the world. The second part of the proposition is more questionable. In earlier articles when I have dealt with various aspects of incomes policy, I have suggested that productivity bargaining may have harmful as well as beneficial results. One thing is certain. Productivity bargaining is only beneficial in

so far as part of the increased productivity is reflected in lower prices to consumers. It is quite wrong that the whole of the benefit should accrue to the workers directly concerned.\* Even where a substantial part of the gain from increased productivity is shared with the community at large through lower prices, there are still dangers if very big increases are given to workers concerned in productivity bargaining. In so far as they accept more arduous conditions of work, there may be a case for substantially increased pay. Where, on the other hand, it is a case of "buying out" restrictive practices, there can be little justification for giving substantially bigger increases under productivity agreements than those given to the general body of workers.

This is not to deny the importance of increasing productivity. Management should always be looking for ways to bring about increased productivity, and the co-operation of the workers in an industry in raising productivity should be a condition for even a "normal" wage increase. The Prices and Incomes board has been sceptical about the chances of getting more labour for "undermanned" industries by offering higher wages or salaries. Under full employment, most employers are short of labour and if an "undermanned" industry or occupation offers greatly increased rewards, its differential advantage will be short-lived because other wages and salaries will also be raised. There is, for example, no easy solution to the teacher shortage by raising salaries. If salaries are out of line with other occupations, either in terms of starting levels or overall career prospects there is a case for revision. By bringing teaching salaries into line with those in jobs calling for people with comparable qualifications, a few more recruits might be obtained. Then it would be for the Government and the profession to ensure that the fullest possible use

\*Even within an enterprise or industry, some workers may have more scope for productivity bargaining than others. In dealing with the pay of railwaymen, for example, the Prices and Incomes Board suggested that the gains should be shared with railway workers in jobs where it was less easy to achieve a measurable increase in productivity. Thus workers increasing productivity should not only share the gains with the community through lower prices but also with other workers in the enterprise or industry.

was made of the available supply of teachers, and not to think in terms of an impossible target for recruitment.

### *Conclusion*

It is essential that everyone in the country should realise the importance of increasing productivity. It is only by increasing productivity that our standard of living can rise. It is also important to remember that it is rarely through any merit of particular groups of workers that scope for increasing productivity exists (unless they have been guilty in the past of restrictive practices), and that therefore all should share equally in the fruits of increasing productivity rather than the gains go mainly to those actually achieving measurable increases in productivity. There may need to be exceptions to the equal sharing of the gains. There may be a case, for example, for deliberately ensuring that the lower paid workers reap proportionately greater benefit.

No mention has been made of other types of income than wages and salaries. I hope some time to deal more fully with the prices aspect of the present prices and incomes policy and also with non-wage incomes (dividends, rents, professional fees and so on). This may have to wait, however, as the new encyclical must clearly be the subject of my next article, and who knows what may happen before the next but one. Indeed, I can even visualise some aspect of the budget (past history by the time this appears, I know) taking precedence over the encyclical.

---



## THE CHURCH AT WORK

In this second article a further section is given of the translation of the Commentary by the *Action Populaire* of the Pastoral Constitution of the Second Vatican Council on the Church in the World of Today dealing with Christian Marriage. The translation is authorised by the French hierarchy.

# The Council & Marriage: 2

JOHN F. McDONALD

(Professor at St. Edmund's Seminary, Ware)

### *Conjugal Love*

49. Many times the word of God tells engaged and married couples to nourish and foster their associations with the love appropriate to it.<sup>114</sup> Many in our time too set high value on true love between husband and wife, which is shown variously according to the legitimate customs of different times and peoples. But that love is above all a human thing, something one person gives to another moved by rational volition; it embraces the good of the person loved as a whole; hence it is able to enrich with a characteristic dignity its own manifestations of body and mind—to give them the nobility which belongs to them as the elements, the special tokens of married comradeship. (h) Our Lord himself graciously made whole, perfected, elevated this love with a special endowment of grace and charity. Such a love associating the human with the divine, leads married people to give themselves to each other freely, with tenderness of affection and action; it pervades their lives<sup>115</sup> and grows by its own generous exercise. It is something far beyond mere

<sup>114</sup>Cr. Gen. 2:22-24; Prov 5:18-20; 31:10-31; Tob 8:4; Cant 1:2-3; 2:16; 4:16-5:1; 7:8-11; 1 Cor 7:3-6; Eph. 5:25-33.

<sup>115</sup>Cf. Pius XI. Encycl. *Casti Connubii*: AAS 22(1930), p. 547 and 548: Denz. 2232 (3707).

erotic attraction which, selfishly indulged, quickly and miserably vanishes.

This love is uniquely expressed and perfected in married intercourse. The sexual activity by which married people are intimately and chastely united is honourable and worthy and, if done in a truly human fashion, it signifies and fosters the self-giving by which the couple gladly and gratefully enrich each other. Such love, ratified by mutual fidelity and above all sanctioned by Christ's sacrament, is unshakably faithful in body and mind, through good times and bad, and so remains a stranger to adultery and divorce. The unity of marriage which our Lord confirmed is strikingly apparent from the equal personal dignity of man and woman, which in its turn is evidenced by their full mutual love. But it takes exceptional virtue to live up to this Christian vocation constantly. Married people, then, fortified in a holy life by grace, will cultivate and pray for constancy in love, largeness of mind and a spirit of sacrifice.

Full married love will be more highly valued, and a healthy public opinion about it formed, if married Christians excel in witnessing to it by their loyalty and harmony and by their devotion in bringing up their children; if they play their part in that psychological, social and cultural revival in favour of marriage which we need today. (i) Young people need suitable and timely instruction in the dignity of marriage, in its responsibilities, in its practical side. They must learn to reverence chastity so that having practised it during their engagement they may, at a suitable age, pass on to marriage.

(h) This paragraph and the one following it aim at doing away with all traces of Jansenist, puritanical influences, Manichean and Platonist points of view which while continuing to suspect the sexual role in the expression of love between the spouses, reserved their praises for conjugal friendship alone. One must note, for example, the statement that conjugal love is fulfilled and grows by the generous exercise of sexual intercourse and not as some would like

to think simply by refraining from sexual intercourse. If it is true that the flesh automatically ensnares and is possessive, it can, nevertheless, under the influence of charity become transformed and co-operate in the self-oblation and free giving of the spirit. In this respect it also determines the role of chastity (cf. n.51 below where it is stated that the solution of the conflict between love and fecundity would not have been found 'if the virtue of conjugal chastity were not practised with a loyal heart').

(i) The Christian couple must be recognised by the witness they give of a life of fidelity. This should be followed by happy results both from the conjugal and parental points of view. The question of the preparation of young people for love and marriage is touched on here but it will be dealt with in n.52.

### *Fecundity of Marriage*

50. Marriage and married love are by their character ordained for the procreation and bringing up of children. Children are the outstanding gift of marriage, and contribute in the highest degree to the parents' welfare. God himself, who said 'it is not good for man to be alone' (Gen 2:18) and who 'from the beginning made them male and female' (Mt 19:4), wished to give man a special share in his work of creation—so he blessed the man and the woman saying, 'increase and multiply' (Gen 1:28). Hence the proper cultivation of married love and the whole character of family life arising from it have the tendency, without thrusting into the background the other purposes of marriage, of disposing married people to co-operate courageously with the love of the Creator and Saviour, who through them continually enlarges and enriches his own family.

In the task of transmitting and rearing human life, a task which must be regarded as their proper mission, married people know that they are co-operating with, we might say interpreting, God's creative love. In view of this they should fulfil their duty with human and Christian responsibility. They should form a correct judgment by common reflection and effort, bearing in mind both their own good

and that of the children born or expected. They will consider carefully the conditions of time and place and their own living conditions, material and spiritual, and they should take account of the good of the family community, of society as a whole and of the Church. This judgment married people must ultimately make for themselves in the sight of God. Yet they must be aware that they cannot proceed arbitrarily. They must be guided by conscience and conscience must be conformed to the divine law; they must submit to the Church's teaching authority which interprets that Law authoritatively by the light of the Gospel. The divine law reveals the full meaning of married love, protects it, impels it towards a truly human perfection. So married Christians, trusting in divine Providence and having a spirit of sacrifice<sup>116</sup> glorify the Creator and grow in Christian perfection when they fulfil the function of procreation with generous, human and Christian responsibility.

(j) Among those who thus satisfy the charge given them by almighty God, special mention should be made of those who prudently and courageously agree to have, and of course properly to bring up, large families.<sup>117</sup>

But in fact marriage is not instituted merely for procreation. The indissoluble character of the personal pact and the good of the children themselves demand that mutual love should be properly shown between a married couple, that it should progress and mature. Even therefore if children, often so much desired, are lacking, marriage persists as a lifelong comradeship, and keeps its value and indissolubility. (k)

### Notes:

(j) We have here, if not a definition, at least a description and an analysis of the elements of responsible fatherhood and motherhood. 1) The awareness before God of a serious mission conferred on the spouses by the Creator. 2) The awareness of a decision that is to be taken by two

<sup>116</sup>Cf. 1Cor 7:5.

<sup>117</sup>Cf. Pius XII, Address *Tra le visite*, 20th January, 1958: AAS 50 (1958), p.91.

people in common agreement and with a like generosity. 3) The awareness arrived at after much thought, of the good to be taken into consideration, that is, of those who are involved in the procreative activity, namely, the parents, the children already born or yet to be born, the future conditions of their existence, the general well-being of the family, of society and of the Church itself. 4) The awareness that in the last resort the decision to bring a child into the world rests upon the spouses alone. On this point we have not had up to now such an explicit ecclesiastical document. (cf. Pius XII, Allocution to the Midwives, 29th October, 1951, and his address to the Family Front, 26th November, 1951). The next point mentioned is a preparation for what will be said more explicitly in n.51 concerning the means which can be put at the disposal of this responsible procreation. The text then goes on to mention the qualities called for in this kind of responsible parenthood. Special mention is made on this occasion of those who willingly have large families.

(k) It is intended here to emphasise the fact that conjugal love is of its nature a desire to procreate children but at the same time it is not only that. It is also an exchange, a sharing, a total communion between two persons. This also gives it its dignity (cf. n.49). Such a statement might strike us as new. In fact the matter had been touched upon briefly by Pius XII in his address to the Midwives when he said: 'The marital act, in its natural setting, is a personal action. It is the simultaneous and direct co-operation of husband and wife which, by the very nature of the agents and the propriety of the act, is the expression of the mutual giving which in the words of Scripture, results in the union "in one flesh."' (See also the address of Pope Pius XII to the Rota on 3rd October, 1941 and his message to the Congress on Fertility and Sterility on 19th May, 1956.) Nevertheless the insistence with which the address to the Midwives recommended that these aspects of dialogue and community of conjugal life, representing 'truly genuine personal values' must however be placed not in the first rank in the scale of values but in the second, is not observed here. Without being very explicit, the new text, especially



if we take into account what has been said in the first paragraph, namely, 'without thrusting into the background the other purposes of marriage', allows us the better to take account of reality; the interdependence between the values of communion and the values of procreation. In order to be truly human, procreation must proceed from a true love of communion. In like manner, in order to be genuine, this love must be directed to and lead to procreation. (cf. previous note on p.2).

### *Married Love and the Respect for Human Life*

51. The Council realises that certain present-day conditions are often obstacles to a harmonious disposition of married life: that circumstances can arise in which the family, for a time at least, cannot be added to, so that it is not easy to maintain mutual love and life faithfully. Where the intimacy of married life itself is broken off, marital fidelity can be hazarded and due fertility prejudiced, for the upbringing of children and the resolution of mind to increase the family are endangered.

Some put forward wrong solutions of these problems, not shrinking even from taking life; the Church on the contrary reminds us that there can be no contradiction between two divine laws—that which governs the transmitting of life and that which governs the fostering of married love. (1)

God, the Lord of life, committed to man the high responsibility of maintaining life—a responsibility to be carried out in a way worthy of men. So life must from its very conception be guarded with the greatest care. Abortion and infanticide are abominable crimes. Man's sexual make-up and the human procreative faculty are remarkably superior to those found in lower grades of life, hence the married sexual activity ordered in accordance with full human dignity is matter for great reverence. Moral behaviour then, when it is a question of reconciling married love with the responsible transmitting of life, does not depend only on a sincere intention and the evaluating of motives, but must be judged by objective standards. These are drawn from the nature of the human person and of its acts, and have regard for

the whole meaning of mutual self-giving and human procreation in the context of true love. This cannot be unless the virtue of married chastity is sincerely cultivated. (m) For children of the Church, taking their stand on these principles, it is not lawful to regulate procreation by embarking on ways which the Church's teaching authority, in expounding the divine law, condemns.<sup>118</sup>

Let it be clear to everybody that man's life and the business of transmitting it are not matters confined to this world or to be understood and measured solely by its standards. They always bear on man's eternal destiny.

### Notes :

1) This section treats of the conflict which often in our day concerns the right which the love of the spouses has to express itself in the way which is proper to it in sexual intercourse on the one hand, and on the other hand the duty which this same love has to provide a regular and responsible procreation. The Conciliar text recognises, as no previous ecclesiastical document has done, that to allow conjugal life not to have at its disposal the means of communication proper to it, is to run the risk of seriously endangering the fidelity of the spouses, the proper education of the children and the ultimate future of the family. Allusion is made to this conflict in order to condemn the 'dishonest solutions' which in this kind of conflict certain families dare to adopt. It is a question of the illicit contraceptive practices already mentioned in n.47. On the problem posed see the notes on this section. These practices are in fact presented as being distinct from abortion, which is considered to be more immoral still. Abortion is put on the same level as infanticide; both are 'murder'. The

<sup>118</sup>Cf. Pius XI, *Encycl. Casti Connubii*: AAS 22(1930), pp.559-561; Denz. 2239-2241 (3716-3718); Pius XII, *Address to the Italian Midwives*, 29 Oct. 1951: AAS 43(1951), pp.835-854; Paul VI, *Address to the Cardinals*, 23 June, 1964: AAS 56(1964), pp.581-589. Certain questions which need other and more careful investigation have been submitted by command of the Pope to a Commission for the study of population, family and birth questions, so that the Supreme Pontiff may give judgment when the Commission has finished its work. In view of this the Council does not intend immediately to propose concrete solutions.

Conciliar text is even more precise on the point that life is absolutely sacred from the first instant of conception. Thus every procedure aimed at preventing nidation of the fertilized ovum must be considered as an abortive practice.

(m) In spite of the existence of a Pontifical Commission appointed to study the question of 'birth control', a question that the Pope has reserved to himself, the Council could not remain silent in the face of the universal anticipation about this particular question: How is the conflict between love and fecundity to be resolved positively? The Pastoral Constitution on the one hand reminds us of some fundamental doctrinal principles which were demanded with some insistence by several Cardinals and a number of bishops who were puzzled and felt apprehensive on account of ambiguities in the text then proposed, a text which was capable of giving rise to a certain subjectivism. (Cf. the intervention of Cardinal Colombo of Milan on 30th September, 1965 [Documentation Catholique, 1965, coll. 1891-1892].) On the other hand a more particular ruling is given for Catholics. It is not permitted for them to make use of means which the teaching authority of the Church condemns. This authority is competent to interpret the moral law. The three references given in a foot note are to Pius XI's Encyclical *Casti Connubii* where the Pope denounced contraceptive practices, to Pius XII's Address to the Italian Midwives where he confirmed Pius XI's condemnation, and to the Allocution of Pope Paul VI to the Cardinals on 24th June, 1964, where he again refers to the problem.

### A. Three Principles recalled

1) There cannot be a real contradiction between the object of the divine law relating to the transmission of life and the requests of true conjugal love.

2) Human sexuality and the faculty of generation in men cannot be put on the same level as those of the lower grades of animals. (Cf. John XXIII: *Mater et Magistra*, CTS trans.n.193: "The transmission of human life is the result of a personal and conscious act, and, as such, is subject to the all-holy, inviolable and immutable laws of God, which a

man ignores and disobeys to his cost. He is not therefore permitted to use certain ways and means which are allowable in the propagation of plant and animal life.") Hence the eminent dignity of the sexual acts of married life and the respect in which they must be held. The actions of man are of a different kind bound up as they are with the expression of a love between persons.

3) From this is derived the fact that if morality in this matter depends partly on the sincerity of the intentions and motivations of the couple, it does not depend less on objective criteria in accordance with which the behaviour of each individual must be judged; the requests drawn from the nature of the human person and its acts. In particular the sexual acts of man are seen as acts of a total self-giving—the giving of persons which is so complete that it implies in itself a relation to another person, the child, when procreation is possible. This last expression, 'when procreation is possible', gives rise to a more particular question concerning the purpose of human sexuality. Must openness to life manifest itself in each and every sexual act of the spouses or in this activity taken as a whole? This is one of the questions which some people consider as having been left in suspense by the Council. Hence the second part of footnote 118 which refers to a later judgment to be given by Pope Paul VI once he has received the report of the Commission which he has set up to study the question of population, the family and birth control.

### *B. The References to Pius XI and Pius XII*

Following the suggestion made by Pope Paul VI the Commission has included these two references in a footnote. (Cf. Letter of Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State to the mixed Commission, 25th November, 1965.) Mgr. Garrone, reporting on the schema had this to say: 'They wanted to assert doctrinal continuity' (La Croix, 4th Dec., 1965). It is necessary above all to consider the sentence to which this footnote refers. It concerns the behaviour in practice of Catholics and not fundamental principles. This causes it to differ greatly in content from the sentence preceding it.

in matters concerning morals Catholics must act according to the rules laid down by the Church's teaching authority. This authority has real power in the Church to interpret the moral law. In the present case Pope Paul himself declared in this Allocution to the Cardinals, which we have referred to above, that no one should arrogate to himself the right to speak in terms which are contrary to the laws of the Church which are still in force.

*The Promotion of Marriage and the Family is  
the concern of all (n)*

52. The family is a kind of school of more abundant humanity. But if it is to achieve the fullness of its life and mission it needs affectionate communion of minds, so that the partners share their thoughts and aims and as parents co-operate zealously in bringing up their children. The active presence of their father is of great help in the children's training, but their mother's care in the home, which the young specially need, must also be safeguarded, without losing sight of the legitimate social advance of woman. Children should be so instructed that when they grow up they will be capable of responsibly following a calling, even a sacred one, and of choosing a state of life. If they choose marriage, then they should be fit to found their own family in favourable moral, social and economic circumstances. It is for parents and guardians to offer prudent advice to the young about founding a family, and the young should readily listen; but parents should not force them into marriage or into the choice of a partner.

So the family in which different generations live together, helping each other to acquire greater wisdom and to harmonize personal rights with other social needs, is the basis of society. Therefore all who influence society and its various groupings should actively contribute to furthering the cause of marriage and the family. The civil power should as a sacred duty acknowledge their true character, safeguard public morality and look after domestic prosperity. The right of parents to have children and bring them up in the family circle should be protected. Those who unhappily are



deprived of family life should be looked after and assisted by legislation and by other measures.

Faithful Christians, redeeming the present time,<sup>119</sup> distinguishing the eternal from the changeable, should diligently further the good of marriage and the family by the witness of their own lives and by co-operation with men of good will. Anticipating difficulties, they should provide for the needs and convenience of families in a way suitable to the present day. Great helps to this will be the Christian sense of the faithful, a general correct moral conscience and the wisdom and skill of experts in the sacred sciences.

Those learned in other sciences, especially biology, medicine, the social sciences and psychology, can also greatly serve the cause of marriage and the family and peace of conscience, if by comparative studies they try to elucidate better the conditions favourable to a lawful regulation of procreation.

The priest's part is to foster the vocation of married people by a variety of pastoral methods: preaching, liturgical worship and other spiritual aids to their married and family life; also to support them humanely and patiently in their difficulties and fortify them in charity, so that really good families may be formed.

Such enterprises as family associations should try hard to support by advice and practical help the young persons and married people, especially the recently married, and train them for family, social and apostolic life.

Finally married people themselves are made in the image of God and have a true personal status. Let them be joined in equal affection, harmony of mind and mutual sanctity.<sup>120</sup> Following Christ, the source of life,<sup>121</sup> in the joys and sacrifices of their calling, may they by their loyal love become witnesses of that mystery of love which our Lord revealed to the world by his death and resurrection.<sup>122</sup>

<sup>119</sup>Cf. Eph. 5:16; Col 4:5.

<sup>120</sup>Cf. *Gregorian Sacramentary*; PL 78,262.

<sup>121</sup>Cf. Rom 5:15 and 18; 6:5-11; Gal 2:20.

<sup>122</sup>Cf. Eph. 5:25-27.

# Book Review

## SHORTFALL

**The R.Cs** (a Report on Roman Catholics in Britain today) by George Scott; Hutchinson, 35s.

EARLY on in his entertaining, impressionist study of Catholicism in Britain, George Scott raises the question of Catholic influence in public life.

It is a little surprising that he should appear puzzled by its absence, for the answer to his question may be found by implication in the first pages of his book. In these he sketches the plight of the Irish poor in mid-nineteenth century England. I have discussed, in this month's editorial, their inability, at the time, to influence Britain's public life. The point I would emphasize here is the persistence into our own day of a habit of mind directly traceable to the mentality bred in Catholics as a result of the ghetto conditions thrust on them by the nineteenth-century industrialism of an alien regime. This has left the Catholic body in this country with a disinclination to make any real attempt at influencing public life. Kept for so long from the merest thought of it by outside forces beyond their control, bottled up in themselves by necessity, Catholics have come to see their duty in terms of the preservation of their Faith within an enclave of religious association and observance. Subconsciously, they still remain thankful for opportunity to practise their religion without risk of persecution. Meanwhile, their attitude to public life remains one of dutiful acquiescence; the prevailing sentiment is one of contentment at being accepted by their countrymen; there is no thought of influencing or, above all, disturbing a *status quo* of which they still remain grateful to be part.

This frame of mind typifies Catholics at every range of social life, whether one thinks of the, in essence, High Tory that Lord Longford appears to some to be, Whigs like St. John Stevas or staunch Labour men like Bob Mellish, boast-

ing that the religion of their constituents makes no difference to their own relationship with them. All appear to me to share this resolve, that their Faith, though firm, should be carried unobtrusively into public life. In this, they are truly representative of their Catholic countrymen. We are so glad, even now, to be allowed to exist; to be regarded as true Englishmen. Our anxiety to prove ourselves is at once pathetic and overwhelming.

There has been no real thought, as yet, that we should go beyond this. It is no coincidence that boys from this country's Catholic public schools should have proved themselves so gallant on the field of battle and, for the most part, so ineffective in public life. True, there exists a group of Catholic M.P's in the House of Commons, good-living men indeed, but, for the most part, just like anyone else in exactly the same way that Catholic officers in a mess are just like everyone else. Meeting them, one is not seized of the thought that they have anything significant to contribute or that they see themselves as meant to contribute it. They are still so thankful to be accepted; so glad to be like everyone else. The prevailing, subconscious sentiment is still relief that they are there—in mess or Central Lobby—at all.

I don't think Mr. Scott has really grasped this point. If he had done so, he would have understood Lord Longford's rather pathetic comment that "Bob Mellish and Maurice Foley have been picked out by the Prime Minister for special praise or responsibility" as no more than the contemporary expression of an ingrained Catholic attitude; the desire to please, to be active in public life, whilst remaining without any realization of the need to influence its course. I doubt whether there is at present a single Catholic peer or Member of the House of Commons; in fact, whether there is any Catholic figure active in public life in this country who has a significant grasp of Catholic social and political philosophy; who speaks persistently against the sort of background that would be supplied by a firm knowledge of Catholic Social Principles.

The reason for this somewhat melancholy state of affairs



not merely the mental attitude that remains as a kind of hangover from the days when Catholics were forced by capitalist oppression and untutored bigotry to take refuge in themselves. There is the additional and somewhat disastrously simple fact that Catholic social and political principles are hardly taught in this country today. Neither is Britain the exception. Not so long ago I met a young Maltese friend who had searched Europe for an institute that taught firmly and authoritatively on these matters. He found none, with the exception of the Royal University of Malta. I was able to add the Jesuit College of Industrial Relations in Dublin, the National University, my own establishment at Claver House, possibly Plater College at Oxford of which I now know very little. Beyond these, nothing. Schools and seminaries, so far as I know, are in the same condition.

Thus, there is no Catholic influence because there is no awareness of its need and there is no awareness because there is no social teaching. If the true road remains unrevealed to the Catholic traveller, he will choose that taken by others and will judge its value by their criteria. So it is with us in the fields of social life and politics. We continue in these spheres to play a game of follow-my-leader. We Catholics contribute nothing. Mr. Scott appears to regard this as a mark in our favour that there is no such thing as a Catholic bloc in politics or social life. Its absence is, in fact, the fruit not of discreet design, but of simple ignorance. We contribute nothing because we are unaware that we have anything to contribute.

And what is this defeat that the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists is supposed, according to Mr. Bob Walsh, to have administered to the Communists in the unions? I am aware of heroic work done and continuing to be done by a very tiny handful of dedicated individuals in the trade-union field. I am certainly not aware of anything significant contributed by the Association as such. Mr. Scott should have pushed much deeper than he did in his chapter on "Shop-floor Catholics". Here he is only skimming the surface.

At present, the ignorance of socio-political principle on the part of English Catholics, clerical and lay, combines with the minority complex which afflicts them to induce a passive mood in public life. Mr. Scott need have no fear. There is no danger of English Catholics seeking to impose on the rest of the community what his mind, rather muddled on this point, would describe as a "minority opinion". Neither is there much hope that they will seek by persistent, concerted action to persuade their countrymen that public life should be based on the God-given principles of the natural law which apply to all men irrespective of their condition, race and creed. Catholics, as already explained, do not know what these principles are because they have never been taught them, even though they are in the guardianship of the Church to which they belong. Moreover, in this country, they have little desire to be involved as leaders; to shake things up on a basis of principle. They are happy to be accepted; this is their limit. If the Prime Minister speaks well of Maurice Foley and Bob Mellish, this is a victory for the cause, another step along the long, hard road towards recognition on a basis of equality with our countrymen, which we have trodden since penal days. We are still working our passage. Let no one rock the boat—except the New Left, and they are approved of, not because they are Left, but because they are "with it", helping, therefore, to get us accepted; applauded now, at bottom, for the same reason that, twenty-five years ago, we applauded Catholic winners of the Victoria Cross, because their actions proved how English they were. Nowadays, the currency has changed. We deal in base metal, but motive for applause remains the same.

By way of a final point, I cannot help wondering whether the present doctrinal disputes within the Catholic Church in England are not basically by way of compensation for the failure of English Catholics in the more recent past to affect society in any really significant fashion.

Paul Crane, S.J.